



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/931,840	08/16/2001	Matthew D. Birder	15437-0542	4551

29989 7590 06/25/2004

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP  
1600 WILLOW STREET  
SAN JOSE, CA 95125

EXAMINER

FILIPCZYK, MARCIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

3

DATE MAILED: 06/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/931,840

Applicant(s)

BIRDER, MATTHEW D.

Examiner

Marc R Filipczyk

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is in response to application filed on August 16, 2001 in which claims 1-24 are presented for examination. The change of address submitted on 11/07/2002 has been noted.

#### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "targe" should be replaced by "target".

Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 1, 2, 4-14 and 16-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sundaresan (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,566).

Regarding claims 1 and 13, Sundaresan discloses a computer system and method for generating a transformation document comprising: (fig. 1, 106)  
analyzing a target document; and (fig. 1, item 124)

Art Unit: 2171

automatically generating, based at least upon said target document, a transformation document (fig. 1, item 118), said transformation document capable of being processed in conjunction with a source document (fig. 1, item 112) to transform said source document into a result document (fig. 1, item 126).

Regarding claims 2 and 14, Sundaresan discloses target and source documents are XML (abstract, lines 1-3).

Regarding claims 4 and 16, Sundaresan discloses a target document comprises a particular data structure pattern, and wherein automatically generating said transformation document comprises: (fig. 1)

inserting a template comprising one or more actions into the transformation document, the template causing said particular data structure pattern to be created in said result document when a particular triggering data structure pattern is encountered during processing of said transformation document (fig. 1, item 110 and col. 6, lines 29-67).

Regarding claims 5 and 17, Sundaresan discloses source and target documents both comprise a particular data structure pattern, and wherein automatically generating said transformation document comprises: (fig. 1)

inserting a template into said transformation document, said template comprising a copy action, said template causing said particular data structure pattern to be copied into said result

Art Unit: 2171

document when said particular data structure pattern is encountered during processing of said transformation document (fig. 1, item 110 and col. 6, lines 29-45).

(Note: replacement of data during pattern match is equivalent to copying)

Regarding claims 6 and 18, Sundaresan discloses wherein analyzing said target document comprises:

compiling a list of data structure patterns that occur in said target document (col. 9, lines 55-60).

Regarding claims 7 and 19, Sundaresan discloses wherein automatically generating said transformation document comprises:

selecting a particular data structure pattern from said list; and  
inserting a template comprising one or more actions into the transformation document, the template causing said particular data structure pattern to be created in said result document when a particular triggering data structure pattern is encountered during processing of said transformation document (fig. 1, item 110 and col. 10, lines 46-52).

(Note: Pattern Matching Language (PML) is template based)

Regarding claims 8 and 20, Sundaresan discloses wherein automatically generating said document comprises:

for each particular data structure pattern in said list, inserting a template comprising one or more actions into the transformation document, the template causing said particular data

Art Unit: 2171

structure pattern to be created in said result document when a particular triggering data structure pattern is encountered during processing of said transformation document (fig. 1, item 110 and col. 10, lines 46-52).

(Note: Pattern Matching Language (PML) is template based)

Regarding claims 9 and 21, Sundaresan discloses:

analyzing said source document;

wherein analyzing said source document comprises:

compiling a first list of data structure patterns that occur in said source document;

(fig. 1) and,

wherein analyzing said target document comprises:

compiling a second list of data structure patterns that occur in said target document (col. 12, lines 10-25).

(Note: searching and compiling source and target tree and subtree data structure patterns is equivalent to compiling two lists of data structure patterns)

Regarding claims 10 and 22, Sundaresan discloses wherein generating said transformation document comprises:

determining whether any data structure pattern on said first list is identical to a data structure pattern on said second list; (col. 12, lines 13-15) and

in response to a determination that a particular data structure pattern on said first list is identical to a data structure pattern on said second list, inserting a template into said

Art Unit: 2171

transformation document, said template comprising a copy action, said template causing said particular data structure pattern to be copied into said result document when said particular data structure pattern is encountered during processing of said transformation document (col. 12, lines 19-21).

Regarding claims 11, 12, 23 and 24, Sundaresan discloses a third document of a particular type (fig. 1, item 116 of 112).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sundaresan (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,566) in view of Nasr et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,263,332).

Regarding claims 3 and 15, Sundaresan discloses all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above in claim 1 including a transformation document (fig. 1, item 122, Sundaresan) and briefly discusses XSL transformations (see col. 4, lines 1-26), but does not expressly teach the transformation document is in XSLT.

However, Examiner asserts that transforming XML documents by using XSL is notoriously well known. Further, Nasr teaches transforming XML documents by submitting a

Art Unit: 2171

target query with XSL specifications (fig. 3, items 320 and 380, Nasr). Hence, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Sundaresan's transformation document format to XSLT. One would have been motivated to use XSLT because XSLT is an XML based language for rendering documents.

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc R Filipczyk whose telephone number is 703-305-7156. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MF  
June 18, 2004

  
SAFET METJAHIC  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100